

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON
JPR
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

JUDGES TABLE OF CONTENTS

Who Judges the Judges PAGE 44

Statewide Arizona Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal

Judges Summary – Appellate Courts PAGE 45

Judges Details – Appellate Courts..... PAGE 46

Trial Courts by County

Judges Summary – Pinal County Superior Court PAGE 48

Judges Details – Pinal County Superior Court PAGE 49

Judges Summary – Pima County Superior Court PAGE 51

Judges Details – Pima County Superior Court PAGE 52

Judges Summary – Maricopa County Superior Court PAGE 55

Judges Details – Maricopa County Superior Court..... PAGE 58

JPR Voter Checklist..... PAGE 76

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON **JPR** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES? YOU DO! WE CAN HELP.

Voters! Finish the Ballot!

Use the following summary and report by the Commission on Judicial Performance Review (JPR) to Finish the Ballot! The JPR Commission was established by voters to evaluate judges' performance during retention elections. While judges initially are appointed, this report can help you decide whether these judges meet judicial performance standards and should be retained. Which judges appear on your ballot depends on your county and the court on which the judge serves. By using this report to finish your ballot, you will help ensure Arizona's strong and impartial judiciary!

Some Arizona judges are appointed through Merit Selection and rated by the JPR Commission.

Merit Selection and Retention

In 1974, Arizona voters decided that for Arizona's Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Superior Courts in counties with populations over 250,000 (currently Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal) judges would be appointed by the Governor from a list of qualified candidates. The Arizona Constitution directs commissions to nominate candidates based primarily on their merit, with consideration given to the diversity of Arizona's population. Arizona voters then periodically vote whether to retain these judges as their terms expire. This system is known as Merit Selection and Retention.

JPR Commission Evaluations & Report

Created by a constitutional amendment, the 30-member JPR Commission conducts standards-based performance evaluations of judges. Most of the JPR Commissioners are public members, not lawyers or judges. JPR reports its results to the public. This report provides JPR Commission findings, survey results, and states whether each judge in a retention election "meets" or "fails to meet" judicial performance standards.

Judicial Performance Standards

The JPR Commission evaluates each judge up for retention election to assess the judge's:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

Public Input Throughout the Process

This year, as every election year, the JPR Commission sought public input from citizens who have had direct experience with judges and made its decisions using that input. In 2013, 60,000 surveys on judges were distributed to attorneys, jurors, litigants and witnesses. The JPR Commission held public hearings open to anyone wishing to speak about the judges up for retention this year. The JPR Commission accepts signed, written comments about merit-appointed judges at any time.

Use JPR Results and Checklist

Every Voter can take an active role in this judicial review process. Use this JPR summary and report to guide your votes for judges up for retention. After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the Judges Checklist tear-off sheet in this pamphlet. Refer to your checklist to **Finish Your Ballot!**

Visit www.AZJudges.info for more information.

*Contact the Commission on Judicial Performance Review: (602) 452-3311
or email jpr@courts.az.gov*

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

NONE

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:

Scott Bales

Robert Brutinel

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:

Andrew W. Gould

Randall M. Howe

Diane M. Johnsen

Patricia A. Orozco

Samuel A. Thumma

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:

Garye L. Vasquez

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Bales, Scott	29	0	0	0	46
Brutinel, Robert	29	0	0	0	46
Gould, Andrew	29	0	0	0	46
Howe, Randall	29	0	0	0	46
Johnsen, Diane	29	0	0	0	47
Orozco, Patricia	29	0	0	0	47
Thumma, Samuel	29	0	0	0	47
Vasquez, Garye	27	0	2	0	47

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>BALES, SCOTT</u> Appointed to Supreme Court: 2005	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	100%
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

<u>BRUTINEL, ROBERT</u> Appointed to Supreme Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	90%	100%
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	97%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	90%	100%

<u>GOULD, ANDREW</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	89%	99%
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	94%	100%

<u>HOWE, RANDALL</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	100%
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	N/A
	Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
	Administrative Performance	94%	100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>JOHNSEN, DIANE</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division 1: 2006	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	89%	94%
	Integrity	98%	90%
<u>OROZCO, PATRICIA</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division 1: 2004	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	89%	97%
	Integrity	98%	98%
<u>THUMMA, SAMUEL</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	84%	100%
	Integrity	100%	100%
<u>VASQUEZ, GARYE</u> Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	2 Commissioners Did Not Vote		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	88%	97%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PINAL COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

NONE

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Gilberto V. Figueroa

Steven J. Fuller

Brenda E. Oldham

Daniel A. Washburn

Kevin D. White

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Figueroa, Gilberto	29	0	0	0	49
Fuller, Steven	29	0	0	0	49
Oldham, Brenda	29	0	0	0	49
Washburn, Daniel	27	1	1	0	49
White, Kevin	28	1	0	0	50

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>FIGUEROA, GILBERTO</u> Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 1998	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u> Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	<u>Attorney Responses</u> 94% 97% 97% 95% 98%	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u> N/A 100% 100% 100% 100%
<u>FULLER, STEVEN</u> Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u> Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	<u>Attorney Responses</u> 100% 99% 100% 93% 100%	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u> N/A 84% 74% 71% 83%
<u>OLDHAM, BRENDA</u> Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u> Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	<u>Attorney Responses</u> 93% 96% 95% 93% 93%	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u> N/A 100% 94% 95% 93%
<u>WASHBURN, DANIEL</u> Elected to Pinal County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 27 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 1 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u> Legal Ability Integrity Communication Skills Judicial Temperament Administrative Performance	<u>Attorney Responses</u> 86% 97% 78% 84% 94%	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u> N/A 95% 95% 91% 97%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

WHITE, KEVIN

Elected to Pinal County
Superior Court: 2005

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards****1 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
Legal Ability	83%	N/A
Integrity	87%	100%
Communication Skills	76%	100%
Judicial Temperament	75%	100%
Administrative Performance	69%	100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Catherine M. Woods

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Jeffrey T. Bergin

Christopher Browning

Javier Chon-Lopez

Charles Harrington

Danelle B. Liwski

James E. Marner

Richard D. Nichols

Kathleen A. Quigley

Kenneth C. Stanford

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Bergin, Jeffrey	29	0	0	0	52
Browning, Christopher	29	0	0	0	52
Chon-Lopez, Javier	29	0	0	0	52
Harrington, Charles	29	0	0	0	52
Liwski, Danelle	29	0	0	0	53
Marner, James	29	0	0	0	53
Nichols, Richard	29	0	0	0	53
Quigley, Kathleen	29	0	0	0	53
Stanford, Kenneth	29	0	0	0	54
Woods, Catherine	7	22	0	0	54

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>BERGIN, JEFFREY</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	100%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%

<u>BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	93%	98%
	Communication Skills	96%	97%
	Judicial Temperament	90%	98%
	Administrative Performance	99%	98%

<u>CHON-LOPEZ, JAVIER</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	87%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	99%
	Communication Skills	91%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	96%	100%
	Administrative Performance	82%	100%

<u>HARRINGTON, CHARLES</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1999	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	96%
	Communication Skills	98%	97%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	94%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>LIWSKI, DANELLE</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	90%	86%
	Communication Skills	90%	82%
	Judicial Temperament	94%	82%
	Administrative Performance	97%	97%
<u>MARNER, JAMES</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	99%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	98%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%
<u>NICHOLS, RICHARD</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1995	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	97%
	Communication Skills	96%	96%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	98%
	Administrative Performance	99%	98%
<u>QUIGLEY, KATHLEEN</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>STANFORD, KENNETH</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	88%	N/A
	Integrity	93%	100%
	Communication Skills	93%	100%
<u>WOODS, CATHERINE</u> Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2011	Judicial Temperament	93%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	95%
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	7 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	22 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	80%	N/A
	Integrity	88%	100%
	Communication Skills	76%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	83%	100%
	Administrative Performance	82%	100%

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge “MEETS” Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge “satisfactory” or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories.

Judicial Performance Standards include:

- Legal Ability: Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Integrity: Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Communication Skills: Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative Performance: Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION’S VOTE ON THE
MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES**

The following judges DO NOT MEET Judicial Performance Standards

Benjamin R. Norris

The following judges MEET Judicial Performance Standards

MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT:

Mark F. Aceto	Bethany G. Hicks
Aimee L. Anderson	Carey S. Hyatt
Arthur T. Anderson	Brian K. Ishikawa
Bradley Astrowsky	Joseph C. Kreamer
Cynthia J. Bailey	Daniel G. Martin
Janet E. Barton	Rosa P. Mroz
Edward W. Bassett	Samuel J. Myers
Dawn M. Bergin	Karen L. O’Connor
James T. Blomo	Susanna C. Pineda
Mark H. Brain	Jay Polk
Roger E. Brodman	Gerald J. Porter
William L. Brotherton	John C. Rea
Katherine M. Cooper	Peter C. Reinstein
Janice K. Crawford	Emmet J. Ronan
David O. Cunanan	Joan M. Sinclair
Norman J. Davis	Pamela Hearn Svoboda
Sally S. Duncan	David M. Talamante
Boyd W. Dunn	Danielle J. Viola
Alfred M. Fenzel	Randall H. Warner
Dean M. Fink	Joseph C. Welty
George H. Foster, Jr.	Eileen S. Willett
J. Richard Gama	
Warren J. Granville	
Hugh E. Hegyi	
Michael J. Herrod	

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Aceto, Mark	29	0	0	0	58
Anderson, Aimee	29	0	0	0	58
Anderson, Arthur	29	0	0	0	58
Astrowsky, Bradley	25	4	0	0	58
Bailey, Cynthia	29	0	0	0	59
Barton, Janet	29	0	0	0	59
Bassett, Edward	29	0	0	0	59
Bergin, Dawn	29	0	0	0	59
Blomo, James	29	0	0	0	60
Brain, Mark	29	0	0	0	60
Brodman, Roger	29	0	0	0	60
Brotherton, William	28	1	0	0	60
Cooper, Katherine	29	0	0	0	61
Crawford, Janice	29	0	0	0	61
Cunanan, David	29	0	0	0	61
Davis, Norman	29	0	0	0	61
Duncan, Sally	29	0	0	0	62
Dunn, Boyd	29	0	0	0	62
Fenzel, Alfred	29	0	0	0	62
Fink, Dean	29	0	0	0	62
Foster, George	28	0	0	1	63
Gama, J. Richard	29	0	0	0	63
Granville, Warren	29	0	0	0	63
Hegyi, Hugh	29	0	0	0	63
Herrod, Michael	29	0	0	0	64
Hicks, Bethany	29	0	0	0	64
Hyatt, Carey	29	0	0	0	64
Ishikawa, Brian	29	0	0	0	64
Kreamer, Joseph	29	0	0	0	65
Martin, Daniel	29	0	0	0	65
Mroz, Rosa	29	0	0	0	65
Myers, Samuel	29	0	0	0	65
Norris, Benjamin	3	25	1	0	66
O'Connor, Karen	29	0	0	0	66
Pineda, Susanna	29	0	0	0	66
Polk, Jay	29	0	0	0	66
Porter, Gerald	18	11	0	0	67
Rea, John	29	0	0	0	67
Reinstein, Peter	28	1	0	0	67

Judge	JPR Votes "Meets" Judicial Standards	JPR Votes "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards	Did Not Vote	JPR Commission Member Did Not Vote on Self	Details JPR Page
Ronan, Emmet	29	0	0	0	67
Sinclair, Joan	29	0	0	0	68
Svoboda, Pamela	29	0	0	0	68
Talamante, David	29	0	0	0	68
Viola, Danielle	29	0	0	0	68
Warner, Randall	29	0	0	0	69
Welty, Joseph	29	0	0	0	69
Willett, Eileen	29	0	0	0	69

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

ACETO, MARK

Appointed to Maricopa
County Superior Court: 1995

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS**29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards****0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A
Integrity	99%	97%
Communication Skills	98%	92%
Judicial Temperament	97%	95%
Administrative Performance	99%	98%

ANDERSON, AIMEE

Appointed to Maricopa
County Superior Court: 2007

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS**29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards****0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A
Integrity	100%	84%
Communication Skills	97%	75%
Judicial Temperament	92%	80%
Administrative Performance	93%	76%

ANDERSON, ARTHUR

Appointed to Maricopa
County Superior Court: 1999

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS**29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards****0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	100%
Judicial Temperament	90%	100%
Administrative Performance	88%	100%

ASTROWSKY, BRADLEY

Appointed to Maricopa
County Superior Court: 2012

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS**25 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards****4 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards**

<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A
Integrity	92%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	100%
Judicial Temperament	77%	100%
Administrative Performance	83%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>BAILEY, CYNTHIA</u>	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	96%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	100%
	Administrative Performance	98%	100%

<u>BARTON, JANET</u>	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	0%
	Communication Skills	100%	0%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	0%
	Administrative Performance	100%	0%

<u>BASSETT, EDWARD</u>	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2008	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	94%
	Communication Skills	100%	87%
	Judicial Temperament	96%	94%
	Administrative Performance	100%	97%

<u>BERGIN, DAWN</u>	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	90%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	93%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	94%	100%
	Administrative Performance	95%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>BLOMO, JAMES</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	100%
	Communication Skills	90%	98%
	Judicial Temperament	76%	99%
	Administrative Performance	89%	99%

<u>BRAIN, MARK</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	92%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	96%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	96%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

<u>BRODMAN, ROGER</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	92%
	Communication Skills	96%	94%
	Judicial Temperament	96%	87%
	Administrative Performance	99%	89%

<u>BROTHERTON, WILLIAM</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 28 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 1 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	88%	N/A
	Integrity	90%	95%
	Communication Skills	89%	97%
	Judicial Temperament	74%	99%
	Administrative Performance	95%	98%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>COOPER, CATHERINE</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	93%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	98%
	Communication Skills	92%	83%
	Judicial Temperament	98%	88%
	Administrative Performance	98%	92%

<u>CRAWFORD, JANICE</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	88%
	Communication Skills	97%	86%
	Judicial Temperament	98%	80%
	Administrative Performance	99%	82%

<u>CUNANAN, DAVID</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	92%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	97%
	Communication Skills	88%	75%
	Judicial Temperament	92%	75%
	Administrative Performance	96%	79%

<u>DAVIS, NORMAN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>	
<i>Judge Davis is the Maricopa County Presiding Judge and was reviewed on administrative duties.</i>	Legal Ability	N/A	
	Integrity	97%	
	Communication Skills	98%	
	Judicial Temperament	98%	
	Administrative Performance	98%	

Reading This Data

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge “MEETS” Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge “satisfactory” or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>DUNCAN, SALLY</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	92%	N/A
	Integrity	95%	95%
	Communication Skills	90%	67%
	Judicial Temperament	93%	90%
	Administrative Performance	94%	76%
<u>DUNN, BOYD</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	90%	N/A
	Integrity	90%	90%
	Communication Skills	84%	91%
	Judicial Temperament	84%	89%
	Administrative Performance	84%	88%
<u>FENZEL, ALFRED</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	100%
	Communication Skills	95%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	95%	100%
	Administrative Performance	97%	100%
<u>FINK, DEAN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	93%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	100%
	Communication Skills	95%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>FOSTER, JR., GEORGE</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	1 JPR Commission Member-Did Not Vote on Self		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	89%	N/A
<u>GAMA, J. RICHARD</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
<u>GRANVILLE, WARREN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	99%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
<u>HEGYI, HUGH</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	77%	N/A
	Integrity	97%	94%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>HERROD, MICHAEL</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	N/A
<u>HICKS, BETHANY</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
<u>HYATT, CAREY</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
<u>ISHIKAWA, BRIAN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS		
	29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards		
	0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	N/A

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>KREAMER, JOSEPH</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

<u>MARTIN, DANIEL</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	90%	N/A
	Integrity	90%	100%
	Communication Skills	91%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	91%	100%
	Administrative Performance	94%	100%

<u>MROZ, ROSA</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	99%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%

<u>MYERS, SAMUEL</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	99%
	Communication Skills	96%	96%
	Judicial Temperament	100%	96%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>NORRIS, BENJAMIN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2008	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 3 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 25 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards 1 Commissioner Did Not Vote		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	75%	N/A
	Integrity	87%	93%
	Communication Skills	67%	86%
	Judicial Temperament	59%	89%
	Administrative Performance	84%	90%

<u>O’CONNOR, KAREN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	92%	N/A
	Integrity	91%	100%
	Communication Skills	94%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	94%	100%
	Administrative Performance	98%	100%

<u>PINEDA, SUSANNA</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	86%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	96%	100%
	Administrative Performance	90%	100%

<u>POLK, JAY</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	95%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	88%
	Communication Skills	94%	80%
	Judicial Temperament	94%	73%
	Administrative Performance	96%	67%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>PORTER, GERALD</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 18 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 11 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	93%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	77%
	Communication Skills	88%	66%
	Judicial Temperament	90%	66%
	Administrative Performance	95%	70%

<u>REA, JOHN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	99%	100%

<u>REINSTEIN, PETER</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1998	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 28 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 1 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	92%	98%
	Communication Skills	89%	86%
	Judicial Temperament	80%	89%
	Administrative Performance	94%	88%

<u>RONAN, EMMET</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	96%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	99%
	Communication Skills	96%	96%
	Judicial Temperament	97%	99%
	Administrative Performance	96%	97%

For More Information Visit: www.azjudges.info**Reading This Data**

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge "satisfactory" or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

<u>SINCLAIR, JOAN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	94%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	98%	98%
<u>SVOBODA, PAMELA</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2012	Judicial Temperament	99%	98%
	Administrative Performance	84%	99%
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
<u>TALAMANTE, DAVID</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999	Integrity	100%	92%
	Communication Skills	100%	92%
	Judicial Temperament	100%	92%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	96%	92%
	Communication Skills	94%	86%
<u>VIOLA, DANIELLE</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2011	Judicial Temperament	96%	89%
	Administrative Performance	98%	91%
	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted "Meets" Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet" Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	98%	83%
	Communication Skills	98%	75%
	Judicial Temperament	98%	83%
	Administrative Performance	98%	86%

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Judicial Performance Commission Results indicate how JPR Commissioners voted, whether a judge “MEETS” Judicial Performance Standards based on survey information as well as all other information submitted by the public or the judge. Judicial Performance Surveys percentages show results of surveys completed by respondents based on the averaged results of the survey respondents who rated the judge “satisfactory” or better in combined Judicial Performance Standards categories. For Judicial Performance Standards explanation, see JPR Page 44.

<u>WARNER, RANDALL</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	98%	N/A
	Integrity	99%	100%
	Communication Skills	99%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%

<u>WELTY, JOSEPH</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2007	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	100%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	100%
	Communication Skills	100%	100%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	100%
	Administrative Performance	100%	100%

<u>WILLETT, EILEEN</u> Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999	JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE COMMISSION RESULTS 29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” Judicial Standards 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet” Judicial Standards		
	<u>Judicial Performance Surveys</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Litigant/Witness Responses</u>
	Legal Ability	97%	N/A
	Integrity	100%	92%
	Communication Skills	98%	91%
	Judicial Temperament	99%	94%
	Administrative Performance	100%	94%